WILSHIRE'S

"LET THE NATION OWN THE TRUSTS"

Vol. XVI No. IV NEW YORK & LONDON, APRIL, 1912 Price 2 Cents per Copy

The Post Office and "Wilshire's"

TAFT is certainly continuing the Roosevelt policy as far as using the Post Office to suppress Socialist papers goes.

All my readers know how Roosevelt tried to stop this paper in 1901 by withdrawing its second-class entry and forcing me to go to Canada for my entry. They also know how he persecuted the "Appeal to Reason," and how Taft is continuing the job.

And what has happened to the "Appeal" and "Wilshire's" has happened to many other of the smaller Socialist papers in different parts of the country.

The "Appeal" says that the new rule of the Post Office regarding the sorting of papers by the publisher according to their destination will practically put it out of business, owing to the excessive cost, if it is enforced.

When Congress passed the One Cent per Pound Act it had no intention of forcing the publishers to do any more than hand in their papers to their postmaster and let him do the entire sorting and delivery.

All these rules are simply made by post-office clerks and have no real validity, and some day the Post Office Department will be called down when a President is elected who has some idea of serving the people rather than his own political advancement.

Congress made a cent a pound rate for publishers not because it thought it a remunerative rate—although, as a matter of fact, it is remunerative—but because Congress thought that cheap newspapers were a good way to educate the people.

What greater example of cheek from a subordinate clerk to his employer was ever seen than in Hitchcock advising Congress to double this rate? Hitchcock might as well tell Congress to close up the Smithsonian Institute because it is kept open at a loss. If he wants to save money let him reduce the exorbitant rates paid by the Post Office to the railways.

The one cent per pound rate is a rate made by the legislative department of the Government with full knowledge of why they made it, and it is not in the province of the administrative department to advise upon the matter.

It is not economy which moves the Hitchcocks to try and raise rates and make onerous rules for publishers, but it is the desire to make the task of the public educating itself as troublesome and expensive as possible.

In the last number of this magazine I told how the Post Office, after it had agreed that it was perfectly in order for me to print in London and mail under by second-class entry in New York, had held up my very first number printed in London on the ground that it was not a "domestic publication."

In order to make assurance doubly sure the Post Office also held that the subscription blank enclosed with the same number of the magazine was illegal.

On the date I went to press with the last number I thought it pretty certain, although I knew I was quite within my rights, that upon one charge or the other I would be debarred the entry and my deposit forfeited. A case of history repeating itself.

However, I suppose Taft finally decided that he did not wish to make a martyr of me any more than he did of Warren, and the result is that the Post Office withdrew both charges, and handed my money back, as will be seen from the following:—

United States Post Office
New York, December 19, 1911

Publishers of "Wilshire's Magazine"

Gentlemen,

Regarding the question raised in connection with the November, 1911, issue of "Wilshire's Magazine," relative to its acceptance for mailing as second class matter as a domestic publication, the Third Assistant Postmaster General states that if the "known office of publication" of "Wilshire's Magazine" is maintained at New York, N.Y., the fact that the publication will hereafter be printed in London, England, will not affect its second class status.

Therefore, in accordance with the authority from the Department, this office will continue to accept mailings of the publication as second class matter under its present entry.

Relative to the subscription blanks enclosed with the November, 1911, issue the Department advises that such blanks are permissible, and authorises the refund of the difference between the money deposited at the third class rate of postage and the second class rates.

Very respectfully,
E. M. Morgan,
Postmaster.

Now this letter only confirms what the Post Office wrote me last June. Why it should have held me up and demanded a deposit before it would take the magazine, except merely for the sake of a petty annoyance, is quite beyond my comprehension. I notice that Hitchcock is now asking that Congress nationalize the telegraph lines. As a Socialist I am in favor of nationalizing all public utilities, and yet I am free to admit that the private companies owning the telegraph lines of this country have never stooped to the petty meannesses which have characterized our Post Office, and I tremble to anticipate putting more power into the hands of such as the Tafts and Roosevelts.

J. Ramsay MacDonald, M.P.

Chairman of the Parliamentary Group of the British Labor Party

I ATTENDED the Conference of the Labor Party of Great Britain held recently at Birmingham. The Labor Party is the result of an autonomous union for political action formed a number of years ago of the Independent Labor Party, the Fabian Society and the trade unions. It has now elected 42 members in Parliament, largely by co-operation with the Liberal Party.

The trade unions are not definitely Socialist, but there can be no doubt but that they are becoming more and more so every year, and that the ultimate outcome will be the adoption of a straight out-and-out Socialist platform by the Labor Party. The Social-Democratic Party—now the British Socialist Party—at one time sent delegates to the Labor Party, but owing to difference of attitude toward certain questions the delegates were withdrawn.

In some way this withdrawal seems a mistake, inasmuch as the Conferences certainly afford an unrivalled platform for Socialists to educate trade unionists. While the Independent Labor Party, with Keir Hardie and Ramsay MacDonald with their opportunist Socialism, have done a certain amount of work—good work, too—on this line, nevertheless I cannot but feel that an injection of Marxian Socialism from men like Hyndman and Quelch would be of great leavening power.

At present the Labor Party is neither fish, fowl, nor good red herring; in fact, if it were herring at all it would certainly not be "red."

The workers generally are neither satisfied with the Parliamentary results of the Labor Party, nor of its general propaganda work throughout the country.

And no wonder. The party set itself out to "do" things rather than talk, and so far very little has been done, and whatever has been done the whole credit has been absorbed by Lloyd George.

It is all very well to complain, but when we reflect that the Labor Party is admittedly at best but an opportunist party, and when we remember that it has to contend with a party like the English Liberal Party, led by a master of strategy like Lloyd George, there is a valid excuse of having made little headway.

We Socialists in America have to meet no leader of the calibre of the Chancellor of the British Exchequer.

I will quote what the new leader of the Conservatives, Bonar Law, said in a recent speech about George to give an idea of what both the Conservatives and Labor Party must contend with:—

> Only a few weeks ago the Chancellor of the Exchequer reached the loftiest height—or touched the lowest depths—of demagogy—(cheers and a Voice: "That's got it")—when he made the interesting discovery that the whole annual income of this country, if divided, would give £200 a year to every family in the land. (Laughter.) It is not a new discovery, ladies and gentlemen. The same gospel has been preached for a score of years at least, by Socialist orators at street corners, but I am quite sure of this, that no Socialist member of the House of Commons could preach it now with decency—(laughter)—for he would know that his first job was to divide his own salary—(loud cheers and laughter)—and make two families happy instead of one. (Laughter.) How many families could be made happy by the salary of the Chancellor of the Exchequer—(laughter)—is a calculation which I leave you to make for yourselves. That doctrine, that utterance, if it means anything, is not Socialism; it is communism. (Hear, hear.) If it means nothing, it is cant. (Loud cheers.) These methods, as I have said, are not new. They have been tried many times in many countries, and they have always ended not in disaster, but in utter ruin. (Cheers.)
>
> That is one alternative. Tariff Reform is the other.

Bonar Law's suggestion that Tariff Reform, and by that he means a higher tariff, is the alternative to Socialism is, of course, supremely ridiculous, especially so to us Americans who have been feeding on the husks of Protection for 50 years and growing thinner every day.

On the other hand, when George talks about dividing up the national income equally it is pretty hard for Ramsay MacDonald and his Labor Party to hold the ear of the public with shouts for the repeal of the Osborne decision and other similar reforms.

I bring in MacDonald's name because he is chairman of the Parliamentary group, and generally admitted to be the ablest spokesman of the party, and probably their ablest man generally.

However, that he is not of that type which makes unity between the Labor Party and the British Socialist Party easy may be seen from the following extracts taken from an article by him in the current number of the "Socialist Review" entitled "A Plea for Puritanism."

I might explain that the British Socialist Party is a strictly Marxian Socialist Party, the inheritor of the Marxian tradition of scepticism as to both bourgeois religion and bourgeois economics. Hyndman and Belfort Bax were founders nearly 30 years ago of its predecessor, the S.D.F., and both are still active spirits in it, Hyndman being chairman of the Executive Committee.

On the other hand, the Independent Labor Party rather follows the Nonconformist or Puritan attitude toward religion; there is a great deal of black-coat wearing and church-going of a Sunday among its members, especially in Scotland.

It is unnecessary to say that in the various squabbles between the two parties the I.L.P. has had good reason very probably to think that their "Puritanism" has been remarked upon by the Marxians.

Says MacDonald: "Puritanism does not fall into the error of putting history on an economic basis."

I doubt if the Puritans ever attributed the course of any historical events to anything other than the will of Jehovah, but certainly it sounds queer to an American Socialist to hear MacDonald going so far in his disavowal of Marxian theory as to indicate his sympathy with the belief that an historical event of, say, the invasion of the Goths, to which he alludes, had not an economic basis.

"It (Puritanism) can, therefore, be easily laughed at by the Pagan, whom, when its time comes, it can cleave to the brisket with its sword, or smash to pulp with its fist, if he has not drunk or rioted himself to death before that time comes."

I am not sure what MacDonald means by the foregoing. Apparently it is a warning to Marxians that they had better sign the

pledge and practise ju-jitsu if they expect to avoid being cleaved or pulped.

They can't hope to escape by any disguise, because Puritanism "has the insight to know the devil when it sees him. . . . It has even the divine faculty of seeing their approaching shadows when they themselves are still afar off."

Puritanism, according to MacDonald, "accepts oatmeal as sweet, and spiced foods it rejects as poison." Evidently he, for one anyway, don't think the Scotch are healthy in spite of their oats and not on account of them.

The ordinary idea of Puritanism is that it is unbending and stern. But not so according to MacDonald's protean definition. "The Labor movement must welcome Puritanism . . . the reasons are . . . that our young men who join us . . . must learn how to face the elements as well as to scud away. I often think of the many gay vessels that have been launched . . . the majority of them have foundered. My own little craft has been there for a quarter of a century."

Puritanism evidently believes in the theory of he who talks and scuds away will live to vote another way. Why founder when one can scud? Why? I don't see why not myself. John Burns scudded into the Cabinet. What?

The "Puritan Sabbath taught the mind to surmount difficulties. . . . One sombre day in the week is not a bad thing for men who, like Socialists, have to carry on a war which calls for moral weight. . . . In the shadows a man is taught to value himself and his circumstances. He can discover where he is . . . and make up his mind what to do."

"But even if he fail in this . . . he will at least acquire the faculty of holding in contempt all dandies whose principles consist merely in an adornment of red ribbons, and whose attractiveness to the virgin eye of the yokel is so often that they (the ribbons?) do not always cover nakedness. In fact, about the new British Socialist Party and similar movements there is a variety of pose like what one sees in the women at a fashionable society dinner, or, later in the evening, on the streets."

However, MacDonald, notwithstanding this comparison of the posing of the British Socialist Party to that of "the women on the streets," declares that "the power to censure is the badge of the slave-driver, and if our 'comrades' had got to the moral root of the matter they would be above that sort of thing, they would reason with their weaker brethren (nor would they) blather out the first thing that comes into their heads."

I give MacDonald's article not on account of its intrinsic worth, but because I think that his position in the Labor movement in England justifies the publicity.

He is "sane and sensible."

Mere Government Ownership No Solution

Most Socialists will agree that Government ownership under the present competitive system presents many difficulties and shows many failures both in this country as well as in Europe.

But this is no argument against Socialism, inasmuch as the difficulties a Government encounters under a system of capitalism, when the people have divergent interests, are largely removed when these interests will be reconciled under a Socialist system.

There is a fast-growing sentiment in this country that the present system of private ownership of railways is played out, and yet the alternative of Government ownership is, as said, seen to have many alternative drawbacks.

One of the men who sees this dilemma is W. W. Cook, the great New York corporation lawyer and counsel for the $100,000,000 Mackay Telegraph and Cable Company.

He says in "McClure's" for January:—

> Commissions may reduce rates, regulate abuses, and stop further issues of watered stock; but commissions cannot reach the root of the trouble—namely, Wall Street control of the railroads, and to that extent a tremendous influence over the Government; the rapid heaping up of colossal fortunes by means of that control; the pushing of the middle-class man into a niche where he gets a living and no more; the growth of a proletariat which is always ready to give trouble, especially in hard times; and the gradual absorption of wealth and power by the capitalistic few. Other remedies more recently proposed—such as a federal incorporation act—are equally impotent. The process of corporation control continues, and under present circumstances will continue.
>
> The fact is that, in spite of all efforts to prevent it, the power of our American railroads is being every day more than ever before concentrated in Wall Street. More than that, private capital—principally centred in Wall Street at present—has an almost absolute control not only of the railroads, but also of the great industrial companies owning the natural resources of the country other than agricultural. This means the control of prices, and the control of men, and ultimately the control of the Government itself, unless that control is wrenched from the grip of capital. The question is whether capital shall control the public and its government, or whether democracy shall control the Government—whether men shall allow their employers (the corporations) to be controlled by capital in a few hands, or whether men shall be free and capital be subject to their control, directly or indirectly. That is the great question which faces modern nations. It is a world-wide and colossal problem, but nowhere so great as here.
>
> History tells what happened when the privileged classes of Rome absorbed the wealth of the Republic. There, too, arose the question of whether concentrated wealth, with all the power it represented, should dominate the Government and the people. The proletariat grew in numbers. The debtor class increased and became desperate. The common people became discouraged. Then a few daring and unscrupulous men raised the standard of revolt. Confiscatory laws were passed and civil war broke out. Cæsar became Dictator to restore order—and the Republic was gone for ever.
>
> Now, anyone with the slightest foresight can see that the present condition of things cannot continue indefinitely in the United States. As the "Outlook" for July 30, 1910, said: "The railway question is another form of the fundamental issue between oligarchy and democracy."

However, Mr. Cook's solution by means of a twenty-five billion dollar quasi-Government company to own and operate the railways is impossible, not because it would not be better than either the present system or of Government ownership, but because it would be a logical and formal admission of the rights of a permanent plutocracy.

If we were to have a continuance of the system of the private ownership of wealth, then Mr. Cook has a plan well worth considering, but as we are not he is wasting his time.

His remedy should have been offered thirty years ago.

The mortality statistics of the Turco-Italian war continue to lead those of football.—"Pittsburg Gazette-Times."

"The per capita circulation of the country is now $34.35." Then why all this kicking because speculators boasted the price of baseball tickets? The best seats did not cost over $20.—"Rochester Democrat and Chronicle."

The Sugar Trust has engaged twenty-five lawyers to defend it in the New Jersey case. After the lawyers get through collecting their fees the ultimate consumer may consider himself thoroughly avenged.—"Grand Rapids Press."

Established 1900

WILSHIRE'S MAGAZINE.

Published Monthly by Wilshire Publishing Co., Room 213, 123, Liberty Street, New York City.

GAYLORD WILSHIRE, Editor.

Subscription, Post Paid to any address in the World, 25 cents per year.

GAYLORD WILSHIRE.....*President.*
H. R. KEARNS.....*Vice-President.*
WM. H. LEFFINGWELL.....*Sec'y and Treas.*

Entered at the New York Post Office as second class matter.

London Office: GOLDER'S GREEN, London, N.W.

Vol. XVI. APRIL, 1912 No. 4.

The Duty on Sugar

The meanest and at the same time the greatest robbery that our Government practises against the poor is involved in the duty on sugar.

It is mean because it falls heaviest upon the poor, for the percentage of their income which goes to pay the duty is infinitely greater than that of the rich. A rich man's family and a poor man's consume about the same amount of sugar, but where an additional $8 per year is not noticed by the one it is a heavy burden to the other.

The sugar duty is about 2 cents per pound, and brings in a total revenue of about $150,000,000 per year.

Approximately every family in America pays $8 per year to the Government on account of the duty on sugar.

The duty is not wanted by the refiners; they are quite able to take care of themselves.

Our American beet-root growers have only a faint interest in the tariff, because they to-day are selling their beets at the same price to the factories that the European grower gets for his beets. There could be no importation of beet sugar owing to ocean freights, quite apart from a tariff.

The only people who get any real benefit from the tariff are the Louisiana sugar-cane growers, but they produce less than 1 per cent. of the sugar we use.

Louisiana is no place to raise sugar, anyway; there is always so much danger of frost that they must cut their cane green, consequently their cane yields only about half the per cent. of sugar compared with that of sugar cane in Cuba.

It is absurd that the people of the United States should pay out $150,000,000 per year to keep a few Louisiana sugar growers alive when with all the help they get they produce less than 1 per cent. of the total.

We have noticed a great revolt in the late German elections of the people against hunger duties. The German tariff on sugar, which, by the way, is the highest in Europe, is just one quarter the American sugar tariff.

However, this is God's country, where the people are quite at liberty to starve themselves if they have a mind to do so.

Hichborn's California

I don't know of any book that gives such a concrete account of the reforms the American people are now striving for, and how they are getting them in California, than Franlin Hichborn's story of the California Legislature, 1909-1911, published by the J. H. Barry Co., of San Francisco.

Being an old Californian myself, I have always taken a great interest in State politics ever since the time when, in Los Angeles over 20 years ago, I ran for Congress as a Socialist.

True enough, although, even in that early day I had the Initiative, the Referendum, the Recall, and Woman Suffrage in my platform, with all my enthusiasm I knew that I was battling for a cause hopeless of immediate success. The old parties would listen to no reform proposals of any kind. They were tied hand and foot to the Southern Pacific Railway.

There was no Socialist Party in California in those days, and while of course I knew that some day and somehow light would break upon the State, the how and the when were not very clear.

The strange thing about the final carrying of all the important reforms mentioned, as well as the throwing off of the Southern Pacific Company yoke, is that it has been done by "Progressive" members of a Legislature elected on old party tickets.

There is not a single Labor or Socialist member in the California Legislature, not even an "Independent," and yet in the teeth of the opposition of the most powerful and corrupt machine in America the most revolutionary measures have been carried through and made into law, including a straight-out Eight Hour per Day Labor for Women Act.

In addition, an Employers' Liability Act has been passed, the efficacy and stringency of the same being evidenced by the fact that it costs me 8 per cent. on the total wages bill to insure the Bishop Creek Company in a liability company.

This practically means that wages throughout the State have been raised about 8 per cent., and the rise has been put into a fund to insure labor against accidents.

The Bill was passed as approved by the trade unions.

No doubt a great deal of all this progressive legislation has been due to the initiative of Governor Hiram Johnson, who is the best governor California has ever had. In fact, for many years she has had no governor, but merely some tool of the Southern Pacific Railway masquerading as governor.

Mr. Hichborn gives the history of the various reform Bills presented to the Legislature, and the story he tells of the tricks the machine tried to prevent passage is most illuminating.

However, with all due honor to the "Progressives" for the good work they have done in California, I cannot but help believe that they have simply prepared the way for the Socialist Party to become supreme there.

By passing all the minor planks of the Socialists, and thus proving to the people by actual trial and experience that they were good Bills, the logical thing is for the people to keep on demanding more and more of the same provender.

And since the Californians now have the Initiative, it is up to them to get what they want; they no longer can whine that the Southern Pacific Railway won't give it to them.

California is rich enough to give everyone a good living. If it is not had, then it is simply because it is not demanded. It is not a mark of any great intelligence when old dog Tray learns how to put his paw on the latch-key to the cupboard and pull down his own bone.

The Initiative is the latch-key for California dog Tray, Labor.

Less barking and more thinking, Tray, if you want your bone.

Resolved: That the State of California guarantees every worker, man and woman, a minimum of $3 per day, and that in case employment is not offered by private employers at this rate, then the State itself shall establish co-operative communities with a State guarantee of $3 per day minimum to the members thereof.

How would something like that do for an Initiative? It would probably not receive a majority of the popular vote the first time, but it would call forth a lot of valuable discussion.

The Aldrich Money Bill

WE have been through two money crazes in America, and I am hopeful we will never again think there is any short cut to the millennium by anything similar to either the "greenback theory" or "free silver."

However, because no changes or reforms of the money system can bring the abolition of poverty as long as we let Rockefeller and Morgan own the earth, that is no reason for saying that during the period of the R. and M. ownership we cannot improve the present financial system under which America labors.

Our money system is the laughing-stock of the world, and our only satisfaction in it is that bad as it is we felt, quite rightly, that Bryan would have made it worse.

See how it works. Smith, of Podunk, is accustomed to borrow $5,000 every fall from the Podunk National Bank to carry along his fall trade. This year we will suppose he goes to the bank and is astounded to learn that, owing to war in Tripoli or revolution in China or Morgan's influenza, the bank can't let him have his money as usual.

The bank is not afraid of Tripoli or China or Morgan, but somehow or other it finds that it has no funds to loan. The bank is just as much disgusted as is Smith. The result is that Smith cannot carry on his business and certain workers lose their jobs. It is a "dull season" in Podunk.

Smith is solvent, worth $20,000, and his note for $5,000 is perfectly good.

The Aldrich Bill provides a method by which the local bank can practically get the Government to print, or allow to be printed, greenbacks, or, rather, national bank notes, to exchange with Smith for his note.

The bank must pay something to the Government for this privilege, but as it makes Smith pay still more it is quite satisfied. Smith is of course satisfied, for he gets the Government printed money with which he can transact his business.

While the money is paper, nevertheless it is exchangeable for and redeemable in gold. The very fact that the banks throughout the country will be enabled to get such notes printed whenever there is a demand for money will absolutely prevent any "money panic" ever happening in the future.

Such an improvement in our money system would make the industrial machine move along more smoothly and with less jerks. It would enable the capitalists to pile up profits faster, because there would be more profits made. The working man would get steadier employment and possibly better wages if he was insistent enough.

Fundamentally the Aldrich Bill has nothing to do with Socialism, for all Socialists recognize that the cause of poverty is the private ownership of the means of production. Fiscal legislation does not touch upon this ground.

The Aldrich Bill merely allows the workers a better opportunity to make more profits for the capitalists. As this better opportunity means steadier employment, I can see no reason why Socialists should not let the Aldrich Bill go on its inevitable way to become law without getting unduly excited about it.

It may be a good policy to get Socialist votes, this denouncing of every reform measure proposed by anyone who is not a Socialist, but it is bad economics.

It may be argued that all banking should be conducted by the Government, and that the Aldrich Bill gives over to private bankers a function of the State.

I reply that the same argument might be made about allowing a private water company to improve its water supply to a city. True enough the city should own the works, but until it does own them then let the company give the best water possible.

However, as to the feasibility of the State taking over banking under present conditions, that is a far more debatable question than of taking over a waterworks or a railway. The private banker today bases his loans upon the security of private property owned by his customers.

It requires considerable judgment to be a good banker, and the commercial penalties for lending money to the man who cannot repay are visited upon the banker in a very direct way. He loses his money.

Therefore, when it is proposed that the Government take over the banking and appoint a town banker to lend the public money as it now appoints the city postmaster to sell stamps, it does not take much imagination to see that the two cases are not on all fours by a long shot.

That the Government could establish public pawnshops, where for every loan something tangible in the shape of a silver teapot or the like were put up as security, would be admitted. But that the Government as it is now constituted could go into the business of commercial banking is quite another matter.

It seems to me that banking would be one of the last functions to be undertaken by the State.

I can see the logic of the State taking over the property of the private owners, but I cannot see the logic of the State lending those owners money upon their private property.

If the State can afford to lend the owners money upon their property it can afford to buy their property, and that would be a much more sensible undertaking.

German military experts predict that the war between Italy and Turkey will be long drawn out. Let us hope not. Somebody may be killed if it is not brought to a speedy close.—"Rochester Democrat and Chronicle."

Milwaukee Deserves Better Luck

GREAT credit, judging by the final test of results, must be awarded to the Socialists of Milwaukee for their success in carrying the local elections there, and also for their apparent success in municipal management.

However, I would suggest that the petty underhand tactics which the Milwaukee "Social-Democratic Herald" has been accustomed to use in the past are hardly adapted to the present, when success has brought it more or less into the sunlight of national publicity.

The "Herald" is now engaged in two arduous tasks. One to stifle all opposition to the Berger opportunist brand of Socialism, and the other to raise money throughout America for the upkeep of the new Socialist daily paper in Milwaukee.

Certainly no Socialist can object to a straightforward argument on the part of his opponent against any particular line of tactics. If the Socialist cannot bear to have his plans debated, then he had better quit, but the attack must be a fair one.

Milwaukee's ideas as to Socialist tactics differ from the rest of the country. For instance, I doubt if it would be possible for a Socialist anywhere else than in Milwaukee to advise his party to leave one office on the Socialist ticket blank in order that Socialists might vote for an old party candidate, as did Victor Berger not so very long ago.

I am not criticising this action at this juncture, but simply calling attention to the fact that Milwaukee tactics are not the conventional American tactics. They may be better, they are certainly different.

Probably one of the severest critics of the general Milwaukee policy is Wm. D. Haywood, who has recently been elected to the National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party.

Now I wish to say that I myself am no supporter of the Haywood policy of, what shall I call it? Well, say, "impetuosity." However, that is no matter. I would be as impetuous as Haywood did I think that the American people could never get Socialism except through the Berger opportunism of "wait a hundred years, and meanwhile be glad to get $4 per week after you get to be 60."

However, it seems to me that the method that the "Social-Democratic Herald" adopted in trying to defeat Haywood was remarkable for a stupidity only exceeded by its maliciousness.

It may be remembered that some time ago in this magazine I exposed a certain H. T. Jones, a correspondent of the "Social-Democratic Herald," as a self-convicted extortioner, who on the one hand paraded himself as wishing to save the innocent from Wilshire, and on the other hand all the time was trying to force Wilshire to buy stock from him at 100 per cent. profit and later on begging him to publish his Berger eulogy in order that he might get a "footing as an author."

I also showed by the deadly photograph that Jones was accustomed to masquerade about under a great number of different names, and that he wrote me an especially interesting letter over the name of "Silas Hood" explaining what a great man Jones was and advising me to consider his proposition.

With all this history of Jones, alias Silas Hood, being pretty familiar to Socialists generally, is it not extraordinary that when the "Social - Democratic Herald" wished to attack Haywood it should print a letter signed by "Silas Hood"? The letter gave the broadest kind of a hint that the explanation of Haywood's policy was not honest conviction, but because he had sold out to the capitalists. That he (Haywood) was simply trying, in an underhand manner, to disrupt the Socialist Party. Rot, of course, but just think of the stupidity of an editor allowing such innuendos in his paper against a member of the Party backed up by no better authority than "Silas Hood."

I don't see why the "Herald" did not get Jones to sign the letter "Harry Orchard." It would have carried more weight. Harry is a much more artistic liar.

Now, Jones works in a dual rôle. He is not only a tool of the "Herald" employed to stab enemies in the back that cannot be removed by fair means, but he also travels to drum for the "Daily Leader."

As such he is evidently encountering difficulties in raising funds as rapidly as he might wish. Naturally, if he finds that anyone happens to be using his money for other purposes than the "Leader" he becomes disagreeable, especially so if the man is a friend of mine.

It is a difficult task raising $100,000 for a Socialist daily, especially when you try to convince a man that he going to get his money back with interest.

A good newspaper like the "Daily Leader," presenting all the expensive features of its competitive capitalist papers, costs a lot of money to get out.

In fact, it is only because of its advertising receipts that it can hope to live.

The "Leader" must prove to its advertisers that it is good policy for them to patronize it not only for the time being for the immediate profits, but for the long run as well.

An advertiser might think the "Leader" a good medium, but he might also decide that he is not going for the sake of a little immediate profit to build up an organ that advocates the destruction of the very profit system by which he lives.

Then, too, even if the advertiser himself might be willing to take his chance on both present and future, he very often is either in the hands of his local bankers or of New York capitalists, who will refuse to allow him to contribute to the upkeep of a Socialist paper.

Even the strongest of the capitalist papers is in the hands of the advertisers. Arthur Brisbane has often told the story of how near Hearst went under after the McKinley assassination owing to the big advertisers withdrawing their ads.

It was only the chance allegiance of a personal friend of Hearst's, Straus, the owner of the Macy Department Store, that saved the day.

The Labor Party in England are going to establish a paper, and they well recognize the difficulties they are to encounter. Notwithstanding that they have the backing of the trade unions with a membership of over two millions,

and who have subscribed $250,000 to the paper fund, they have set their mark at no less a capital than $750,000 as being necessary to establish the paper. They think this very modest.

The $100,000 that Milwaukee is setting out for on the same kind of a venture rather tends to show the courage of Milwaukee than its experience.

I hope the Milwaukee people and the "Herald" will see that there are other reasons than the few dollars that some of my stockholders, many of whom are not Socialists, are subscribing for the Bishop Creek Mill that may account for their difficulty in raising money.

If the "Leader" could only rely upon the policy of the little Wall Street rag the "Herald" quotes as an oracle about Wilshire it might have a better chance.

There are a number of such so-called "financial journals" in Wall Street that no one by any chance ever hears about until he may happen to be floating a company. He then receives a call from an advertising agent, who very pointedly advises him of the policy of giving the "Financial Parasite" an advertisement, not for the advantage to be derived, but in order to escape an attack which might result if the grease were not forthcoming.

Capital is notoriously timid, and rather than take any chances the promoter will usually give up.

It is such papers that the "Silas Hoods" contribute to when they wish to bleed a victim, and then when their own communication appears in print they send a marked copy to such gullibles as the "Social-Democratic Herald" as expressive of what Wall Street thinks.

In order to still further impress the editor of the "Herald" they often send along another letter from themselves, but, of course, under one of their various aliases, something to the effect: "Would that we had the powerful pen of Silas Hood to awaken the working b'hoys of Boston." The gaff is stronger than the pen.

It is really too bad that the Socialists of Milwaukee, with all their opportunity to let the world see the true calibre of Socialists, should be represented by an editor having such a strange mixture of credulity, smallness and maliciousness.

Milwaukee deserves better luck.

Bergson and His Philosophy

JUST now there is considerable of a Bergson cult, which has been augmented by the success of a series of lectures recently delivered in London by the distinguished French metaphysician.

There is no doubt that much of the attention that he has attracted is based upon the idea that he is supposed to have evolved a scientific soul theory, which is reassuring to those fortunate ones who can take more interest in what may happen to them after they have left the earth than what is happening to them now.

The old religions, in the light of modern criticism, have no longer the power of making the average man absolutely sure of any future existence at all, let alone one of beatific joy.

Therefore the man who can come along with the backing of science to give a glimmer of hope to these longers for a future life is sure to attract a following.

The science which Bergson gives in "Creative Evolution" (Macmillan Co.), while not professing to be original, is up to date and illuminative. His argument as to the inadequacy of either the doctrine of the neo-Darwinians or the neo-Lamarckians to give a reasonable explanation of the evolution of such a complex thing as the eye is both sound and ingenious. He says:—

"And it may be granted, perhaps, that the process is a merely physical one in the case of the color changes of the skin. But if this sort of explanation is extended to the gradual formation of the eye of the vertebrate, for instance, it must be supposed that the physico-chemistry of light has caused the organism to construct a progressive series of visual apparatus, all extremely complex, yet all capable of seeing, and of seeing better and better. What more could the most confirmed finalist say, in order to mark out so exceptional a physico-chemistry? And will not the position of the mechanistic philosophy become still more difficult when it is pointed out to it that the egg of a mollusc cannot have the same chemical composition as that of a vertebrate, that the organic substance which evolved toward the first of these two forms could not have been chemically identical with that of the substance which went in the other direction, and that, nevertheless, under the influence of light, the same organ has been constructed in the one case as the other?

"The more we reflect upon it, the more we shall see that this production of the same effect by two different accumulations of an enormous number of small causes is contrary to the principles of mechanistic philosophy. . . . .

"Neo-Lamarckism is of all the later forms of evolution the only one capable of admitting an internal and psychological principle of development, although it is not bound to do so. . . . . But the question remains whether the term 'effort' must not be taken in a deeper sense, a sense even more psychological than any neo-Lamarckian supposes. For a mere variation in size is one thing, and a change of form another. That an organ can be strengthened and grow by exercise nobody will deny. But it is a long way from that to the progressive development of an eye. If this development be ascribed to the influence of light, long continued but passively received, we fall back on the theory we have just criticised. If, on the other hand, an internal activity is appealed to, then it must be quite different from what we usually call an effort, for never has an effort been known to produce the slightest *complication* of an organ, and yet an enormous number of complications, all admirably co-ordinated, have been necessary to pass from the pigment-spot of the Infusorian to the eye of the vertebrate. . . . . When we think of the enormous number of variations, all in the same direction, that we must suppose to be accumulated before the passage of the pigment-spot of the Infusorian to the eye of the vertebrate, we do not see how heredity, as we observe it, could have ever have determined this piling up of differences, even supposing that individual efforts could have produced each of them singly. That is to say that neo-Lamarckism is no more able than any other form of evolutionism to solve the problem. In thus submitting the various present forms of evolutionism to a common test, in showing that they all strike against the same insurmountable difficulty, we have in no wise the intention of rejecting them altogether. On the contrary, each of them being supported by a considerable number of facts, must be true in a way.

However, after Bergson has made what appears to me a very valid criticism upon the various theories of evolution, he is himself rather vague in his delineation of his own theory, and yet I cannot feel but that fundamentally he is correct and on the right track. He says:—

"According as the undivided act constituting vision advances more or less, the materialty of the organ is made of a more or less considerable number of mutually co-ordinated elements, but the order is necessarily complete and perfect. It could not be partial, because, once again, the real process which gives rise to it has no parts. That is what neither mechanism nor finalism take into account, and it is what we also fail to consider when we wonder at the marvellous structure of an instrument such as the eye. At the bottom of our wondering is always this idea: that it would have been possible for *a part only* of this co-ordination to have been realised, that the complete realisation is a kind of special favor. This favor the finalists consider as dispensed to them all at once by the final cause; the mechanists claim to obtain it little by little, by the effect of natural selection; but both see something positive in this co-ordination, and consequently something fractionable in its cause—something which admits of

every possible degree of achievement. In reality the cause cannot, though more or less intense, produce its effect except in one piece, and completely finished. Accordingly, as it goes further and further in the direction of vision, it gives the simple pigmentary masses of a lower organism, or the rudimentary eye of a Serpula, or the slightly differentiated eye of the Alciope, or the marvellously perfected eye of the bird; but all these organs, unequalled as is their complexity, necessarily present an equal coordination. For this reason, no matter how distant two animal species may be from each other, if the progress toward vision has gone equally far in both, there is the same visual organ in each case, for the form of the organ only expresses the degree in which the exercise of the function has been obtained.

"But, in speaking of a 'progress toward vision,' are we not coming back to the old idea of finality? It would be so undoubtedly if this progress required the conscious or unconscious idea of an end to be obtained. But it is really effected in virtue of the original impetus of life; it is implied in this movement itself, and that is just why it is found in independent lines of evolution. If now we are asked why and how it is implied therein, we reply that life is, more than anything else, a tendency to work on inert matter. The direction is not predetermined; hence the unforseeable variety of forms which life, in evolving, sows along its path. But this action always presents, to some extent, the character of contingency; it implies at least a rudiment of choice. Now a choice involves the anticipatory idea of several possible actions. Possibilities of action must, therefore, be marked out for the living being before the action itself. Visual perception is nothing else; the visible outlines of our bodies are the outlines of our eventual action on them. Vision will be found, therefore, in different degrees in the most diverse animals, and it will appear in the same complexity of structure whenever it has reached the same degree of intensity."

It seems to me that Bergson has given a key to the solution of a very difficult problem. It is rather curious that while Bergson is so well up in the science of biology that he apparently knows so little of the science of sociology.

He tells the story of the boy who was set to turn on and off taps letting the steam into the cylinders of the early Newcomen engine, and who tied a cord to the engine beam to work the taps automatically. Berger assumes that then the boy was "free to go and play" if he chose. This shows how far Bergson is from the life of the worker. If the progress of invention meant more play for man there would be no social unrest, but, as a matter of fact, it means less play. There was far more playing done in the world before the days of the Newcomen engine than there has been since.

However, while Bergson evidently fails to understand all this, yet he is very suggestive in his discussion of what life really is. He refers to the bee, with its life so thoroughly bound up in the hive that if separated from the hive it cannot live for long even though fed. Bergson should logically follow the Socialist philosophy as to the individual man being nothing apart from humanity as a whole, that man is merely a cell in the body of organised man. That man cannot in reality live apart from society any more than can the bee. The soul of man exists not in the individual man, but in human society as a whole, and only to the extent that the individual man knows and feels this has he a soul. With the exception of the Socialists who see, and the artists and poets who feel there are none who really can be at peace with their own souls.

Referring to the individual organism, Bergson says:—

"There is already among scientists a tendency to regard the substance of the organism as continuous, and the cell as an artificial entity. . . . . Very probably it is not the cells that have made the individual by means of association; it is rather the individual that has made the cells by dissociation. But this itself reveals to us in the genesis of the individual, a haunting of the social form, as if the individual could only develop on the condition that its substance should be split upon into elements having themselves an appearance of individuality and united among themselves by an appearance of sociality."

The philosophy of Bergson is a Socialist philosophy, and no doubt he would admit it were he fully conversant with how social evolution is being determined by the industrial evolution.

He seems to understand the psychology of the bee better than that of man.

The hive makes the bee and society makes the man, the more perfect the society the more perfect the man.

La Follette says that party ties are vanishing. So are the collars.—"Philadelphia North American."

Dr. Wiley may yet be called upon to supplement his what-to-eat remarks with a chapter on how to get it.—"Washington Star."

England has just launched the biggest battleship afloat. It will come handy as a target for bigger battleships in a few years.—"St. Paul Pioneer Press."

We have not learned whether it was rain or a poor attendance that put such a crimp in the Turko-Italian championship games.—"Philadelphia Telegraph."

"How would a president look in a pigtail?" giggles an exchange, talking facetiously about China. Well, how did George Washington look in one?—"Cleveland Plain Dealer."

An average of 125 people drop dead in the United States every day. This average will be greatly increased in the year that the express companies come out in favour of parcels post.—"Danville Commercial News."

A Socialist Year Book

The Socialist Year Book; Published by the National Labour Press, Ltd., Manchester, England. Price, 12 cents.

Bruce Glasier, in his "1912 Socialist Year Book," gives us a most valuable collection of statistics regarding the Socialist movement of the whole world from America to Uruguay—thirty-eight countries.

It will be invaluable to the Socialist editor and to writers and speakers upon Socialism.

The Socialist vote of the various countries is given not only for the last elections, but previous ones as well. There is also a short statement of the aim and policy of the various parties as it may be modified to their particular country.

I should say that on the whole the book is very accurate, although I notice some small mistakes as to the United States. In referring to the Socialist Presidential candidate of 1906, he spells it Hatchett instead of Matchett. He also congratulates the American Socialist Party on its becoming Americanized, saying that formerly the movement was confined to foreign workmen whereas now, owing to the more progressive teaching of men like Victor Berger, Hunter, Hillquit, Simons, and Spargo, the character of the movement has been recast. Glasier does not seem to know that three of the five he names are not Americans. Berger is an Austrian, Hillquit a Russian, and Spargo an Englishman.

He also refers to the remarkable development of State Socialism in the "little independent Republic of Panama," although, funnily enough, later he quotes "such is the remarkable system of Government ownership in the Canal zone of Panama," showing clearly enough that he is referring to the operations of the big Republic of the United States and not that of little Panama. However, these are, as said, minor errors. The book is a valuable one.

Some men's love of country decreases in the same ratio as the protective tariff on the goods they manufacture.—"Puck."

Even the most confirmed skeptic must admit that the cost of living is exorbitantly high when an ordinary toga sells for $107,000.—"Kansas City Journal."

It will always be a source of comfort to Mr. Solicitor McCabe to know that he would have had Dr. Wiley ousted if a lot of fussy reformers hadn't butted in.—"Kansas City Times."

Printed for the Proprietors by the Twentieth Century Press Limited (Trade Union and 48 Hours), 37a, Clerkenwell Green, London, E.C.